

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 13-44 were pending in this application.

Claims 13-22 are hereby cancelled and claims 45-54 are hereby added and represent new claims.

Claim 28 is hereby amended. The amendment to Claim 28 is a typographical amendment only and does not affect the scope of the claim.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 45-54 do not represent any new matter and that each of the claims contains limitations that are not disclosed in any of the prior art cited by the Examiner. As such, it is believed that these claims are in condition for allowance and notification thereof is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 13-23, 25-26, 28-29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,717,923, issued to Dedrick (herein, “Dedrick) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,533, issued to de Hond (herein, “de Hond”). Claims 24, 27, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of de Hond and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195, issued to Murphy (herein, “Murphy”).

Claims 13 to 22 have been cancelled. Any rejection of such claims becomes not applicable since the claims are cancelled. It is believed that claims 45-54 better reflect the invention with particular application to limited access information, such as student grades.

With respect to the remaining claims, claims 23-44, the Examiner’s rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) is deficient because the Examiner has failed to address all of the elements recited in the claims. For example, claims 23-44 teach that the first database includes limited access information or information that pertains specifically to an individual user. The Examiner suggests that the first database of the present invention corresponds with the clearinghouse server described in Dedrick; however, the Examiner does not show that the Dedrick clearinghouse server provides limited access information. The Examiner also fails to address the limitations in present claims 29-38 specifying that the information provided at the

first limited access database as well as the attributes contained in the second database are all provided by the information originator.

Applicant respectfully points out that the phrase “limited access information”, as recited in claims 23-44, relates to information specifically relating to an end user, as opposed to general information sought by more than one individual. The specification discloses grades as an example of such information (page 6, lines 16-21). The present claims recite transferring limited access information to an individual over the Internet. In Dedrick, on the other hand, the publisher transmits electronic information to a client system which is suitable for general disclosure and is not specific to an end user. Only once the information is transmitted to the client system, can the information be adapted. (col 6, lines 54-57). However, it is important to note that even the “adapted” information provided in Dedrick is general information which has been customized to suit a user’s preferences and not limited access information specifically related to an end user. For example, the content adapter may change the color of a particular field to whatever color preference is contained in the personal profile database (col 6, lines 40-52). Thus, unlike the present invention, the publisher in Dedrick does not transmit limited access information related to an end user.

Applicant further points out that the limitations in present claims 29-38 specify that the information provided at the first limited access database as well as the attributes contained in the second database are all provided by the information originator. Thus, the information originator possesses information relating to the attributes of the end user in advance of any activity by the user. As a result, advertisements or other information may be adapted by the present invention for a particular end user without any input or activity by the end user. In Dedrick, on the other hand, user attributes are provided by the individual user rather than by the publisher or an information originator. Dedrick discloses that electronic information may be adapted only if sufficient data has been collected in the personal profile database either through the end user’s direct input or through monitoring of the end user’s activities (col 6, lines 54-67, and col 8, lines 64-67). Thus, unlike the present invention, Dedrick relies on activities of the end user in order to customize electronic information.

In view of the above information and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the current rejections. Applicant submits that based on the foregoing, claims

in their present form are allowable over the cited prior art. Applicant further requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should any further questions arise concerning this application or in the event the above amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the examiner and the examiner's supervisor prior to any new office action relating to the present Application. Attorney for the Applicant may be reached at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

By 

John K. Abokhair
Registration No. 30,537
Nahied K. Usman
Registration No. 47,148
Roberts Abokhair & Mardula, LLC
11800 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 1000
Reston, VA 20191
703-391-2900